

APPENDIX D

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PLAN

I. Introduction

The City of Seattle is required by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to have a detailed Citizen Participation Plan that contains the City's policies and procedures for public involvement in the Consolidated Plan process and the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME), Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG), and Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) money.

The community involvement process has three main objectives:

- To determine how well our housing, economic and human development funding is meeting the needs of the community
- To determine what other types of resources and services are needed in the future
- To help develop priorities

ENCOURAGING PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The City will provide community members with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the Citizen Participation Plan and on substantial amendments to the Participation Plan. The City will announce the availability of the Citizen Participation Plan in the Daily Journal of Commerce and community newspapers and make copies available online at:

www.seattle.gov/humanservices/director/consolidatedplan

Copies are also available at the CDBG Administration Office and will also be mailed to individuals by request by calling 206-684-0288.

The Citizen Participation Plan encourages public participation by:

- Facilitating involvement of residents of public and assisted housing and of low- and moderate-income people, especially those living in neighborhoods and areas where CDBG, HOPWA, ESG and HOME grants might be spent.
- Holding public hearings at all stages of the funding process. Hearings must give residents a chance to state community needs, review the proposed uses of funds, and comment on the past uses of these funds.
- Taking whatever actions are appropriate to encourage involvement from people of color, people who do not speak English, and people with disabilities.



The Role of Low-Income People

HUD declares that the primary purpose of the programs covered by this Citizen Participation Plan is to improve communities by providing: decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expanded economic opportunities -- all principally for low- and moderate-income people. The amount of federal CDBG, HOME, ESG, and HOPWA money Seattle gets each year is heavily based upon the severity of poverty, substandard housing conditions, and the prevalence of HIV/AIDS. Hence, it is necessary that the Consolidated Planning process genuinely involve low-income residents who experience these conditions. Meaningful participation from low-income people must take place at all stages of the process, including: identifying needs; setting priorities among these needs, deciding how much money should be allocated to each high-priority need, and suggesting the types of programs to meet high-priority needs; overseeing the way in which programs are carried out; and, commenting on program performance.

The Various Stages of the Consolidated Plan Process

The policies and procedures in this Citizen Participation Plan relate to several stages of action mentioned in law or regulation. In general, these stages or events include:

1. Identification of housing and community development needs.
2. Preparation of a draft plan for use of funds for the upcoming year called the Proposed Annual Action Plan or a new Consolidated Plan. The final Annual Action Plan and Consolidated Plan are adopted by the City Council.
3. On occasion during the year, it might be necessary to change how the money already budgeted in an Annual Action Plan will be used, or to change the priorities established in the Consolidated Plan. In that case, a Substantial Amendment will be proposed, considered, and acted upon.
4. After a complete program year, an Annual Performance Report must be drafted for public review and comment and then sent to HUD.

The Program Year

The "program year" chosen by Seattle is **January through December**.

II. Citizen Comment Overview

The City urges community members to identify needs and share their housing and community development ideas. All comments and suggestions regarding the Citizen Participation Plan, Consolidated Plan, Annual Performance Report, and Section 108 Loan Guarantee Projects are welcome.

- ◆ Community members may comment on the **Citizen Participation Plan** for a period of **fifteen (15)** days from the date of the publication of notice announcing its availability by writing to "Citizen Participation Plan Comments," City of Seattle Human Services Department, CDBG Office, 618 Second Avenue, 7th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104.

- ◆ Community members may comment on the **Consolidated Plan, and where applicable substantial amendment(s)** to these documents for a period of **thirty (30)** days from the date of the publication of notice announcing its availability by writing to “Consolidated Plan Comments,” City of Seattle Human Services Department, CDBG Office, 618 Second Avenue, 7th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104.
- ◆ Community members may comment on the **Annual Performance Report** for a period of **fifteen (15)** days from the date of the publication of notice announcing its availability by writing to “Annual Performance Report Comments,” City of Seattle Human Services Department, CDBG Office, 618 Second Avenue, 7th Floor, Seattle, WA 98104.
- ◆ The Citizen Participation Plan, Consolidated Plan and Annual Performance Report will be made available online on the City of Seattle Department of Human Services website:
www.seattle.gov/humanservices/director/consolidatedplan
- ◆ Persons with hearing impairments may call **(206) 684-0274**.
- ◆ Non-English speaking community members and sight-impaired persons may call **(206) 615-1717** to make arrangements for translated materials and recordings.

III. Public Notice

Public notice shall be provided once certain documents are available, such as the Proposed Annual Action Plan or Consolidated Plan, any proposed and final Substantial Amendment to the Action Plan or Consolidated Plan, and the Annual Performance Report. In addition, public notice shall be provided of all public hearings and all public meetings relating to the use of funds or planning process covered by this Citizen Participation Plan. Public notice shall be provided with enough lead-time for residents to take informed action. The amount of lead-time will depend upon the event.

When will Notices of Public Hearings be Published?

Notice of all public hearings will be published in the Daily Journal of Commerce and community newspapers **fourteen (14)** days prior to the date of the hearings.

Where will Notices be Published?

The City shall publish public notices in the Daily Journal of Commerce and in community newspapers.

To encourage involvement by people of color, people who do not speak English, and persons with disabilities, public notice will also be provided through flyers or letters to neighborhood organizations, public housing resident groups, religious organizations, and non-profit agencies providing services to lower-income people through mailing lists maintained by the City of Seattle Human Services Department and the Office of Housing. The contents will include the date, time, location and purpose of the meeting or hearing or a summary of the content of the newly available document. In addition, a public notice will be sent to any person or organization requesting to be on a mailing list.

Public notices will also be published online at:

www.seattle.gov/humanservices/director/consolidatedplan

Public Access to Records and Information

Seattle will provide the public with reasonable and timely access to the data or content of the Consolidated Plan, as well as the proposed, actual, and past use of funds covered by this Citizen Participation Plan. The City requests that a person notify the City of the request to review documents at least 5 to 7 days in advance of when they want to review them, and when administratively reasonable, the City will attempt to make them available for review in less time.

Access to Meetings

Seattle will provide the public with reasonable and timely access to local meetings relating to the Consolidated Plan process.

Availability of Standard Documents to the Public

Standard documents include: the proposed and final Annual Action Plan and Consolidated Plan adopted by the City Council; proposed and final Substantial Amendments to either an Annual Action Plan or the Consolidated Plan, Annual Performance Reports, and the Citizen Participation Plan.

In the spirit of encouraging public participation, copies of standard documents will be provided to the public at no cost and within a minimum of five working days of a request. No more than two free copies will be provided to those organizations and individuals that request them. These materials will be available in a form accessible to persons with disabilities, when requested.

IV. Public Hearings and Meetings

Public hearings are held in order to obtain the public's views. A minimum of two public hearings must be held. Hearings cover community needs, development of proposed activities and proposed uses of funds, and a review of program performance, i.e. to review what was accomplished with the use of funds spent during the past program year. To ensure that City Council members are able to hear the views of potential and actual beneficiaries of the funds, at least one of the public hearings will be sponsored by the City Council.

Access to Public Hearings

Public hearings will be scheduled at times convenient to most people who benefit or who might benefit from the use of funds and will be held at places accessible by bus. All public hearings will be held at locations accessible to people with disabilities. Provisions will be made for people with disabilities when requests are made at least five working days prior to a hearing. In addition, translators will be provided for people who do not speak English when requests are made at least five working days prior to a hearing.

Initial Public Hearing: The first public hearing on the Consolidated Plan will be held during the spring of each year. The first hearing will cover the following issues:

- ◆ A discussion of the Needs Assessment and Market Analysis.
 - ◆ A review of annual performance from the prior year that assesses how well Seattle met its overall goals and objectives.
 - ◆ A discussion of what programs or activities should be considered in the upcoming year.
-

Second Public Hearing: The second public hearing(s) each year will be held in July. Community members will be provided the opportunity to review and to comment on the draft Consolidated Plan.

Stages in the Process

At least one public hearing will be held each year to obtain the views and opinions about housing and community development needs and the priority of those needs from potential and actual beneficiaries of the funds. In order to encourage public involvement, focus groups and small group meetings will be held prior to the first public hearing to help determine the specific needs and priorities identified by low- and moderate-income people. There will be a considerable effort to engage communities of color and marginalized communities. The meetings will be completed **thirty (30) days** before a draft Plan is published for comment so that the needs identified can be considered by the City and addressed in the draft Annual Action Plan/Consolidated Plan.

The second public hearing will be conducted by City Council at least **fifteen (15)** days after the Proposed Annual Action Plan/Consolidated Plan is available to the public. In addition, this public hearing will be held so that there is at least another **thirty (30)** days before a Final Annual Action Plan/Consolidated Plan is approved by the City Council so that the elected officials can consider the public's comments from the public hearing.

In preparing a final Annual Action Plan, careful consideration will be given to all comments and views expressed by the public, whether given as oral testimony at the public hearing or submitted in writing during the review and comment period. The final Annual Action Plan/Consolidated Plan will have a section that presents all comments, plus explanations of the City's response.

Annual Performance Report

Every year, Seattle must send HUD an Annual Performance Report within 90 days after the close of the program year. In general, the Annual Performance Report must describe how funds were actually used and the extent to which these funds were used for activities that benefited low- and moderate-income people.

The City will provide public notice that an Annual Performance Report is available so that residents will have an opportunity to review it and comment on it. The following procedures apply specifically for Annual Performance Reports:

1. There will be a **fifteen (15)-day** comment period once the Annual Performance Report is made available to the public prior to submitting the report to HUD.
2. Copies of the Annual Performance Report will be available online at:
www.seattle.gov/humanservices/director/consolidatedplan
Or, copies will be mailed to individuals by request by calling 206-684-0288.

In preparing the Annual Performance Report for submission to HUD, consideration will be given to all comments and views expressed by the public. The Annual Performance Report that is submitted to HUD will have a section that summarizes all citizen comments or views in addition to explanations why any comments were not accepted.

Technical Assistance

City staff will work with organizations and individuals representative of low- and moderate-income people who are interested in developing and submitting a proposal to obtain funding for an activity under any of the programs covered by the Consolidated Plan. The level and type of assistance will be determined by the City, but does not include the provision of funds to the group.

V. Substantial Amendments

The City of Seattle must specify the criteria it will use for determining what changes in the planned or actual activities of the Consolidated Plan constitute a substantial amendment to the Consolidated Plan. The following describes those criteria and the procedures for citizen notification and comment on such proposed substantial amendments prior to the implementation of such amendments.

Criteria

Changes in the City of Seattle's Consolidated Plan that constitute substantial amendments include only the following:

- A change in the use of CDBG funds from one eligible activity to another; and
- Any changes in excess of \$50,000 in the amount allocated to any project or activity as shown in the Proposed Annual Action Plan (or in any allocation list subsequently adopted by the City Council).

Procedure

Prior to adoption of any substantial amendment to the City's Consolidated Plan, the City shall publish in the Daily Journal of Commerce, a "Notice of Substantial Amendment to the Consolidated Plan," which will identify the activities involved and the nature of the substantial amendment to be implemented. The notice will advise citizens that they have a period of **thirty (30)** days to seek additional information or to comment on the change by writing to the address below.

Before adopting a proposed substantial amendment, the City shall consider the comments received in writing and oral comments at public hearings and make modifications to the proposed substantial amendment where appropriate. All substantial amendments shall be implemented only after the City Council has adopted the substantial amendment by resolution or ordinance. Amendments to the Consolidated Plan that are not substantial may be submitted for City Council approval at the discretion of the Human Services Department Director. The final adopted substantial amendment shall be made available to the public and a copy of the amendment shall be forwarded to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development in the form of an amendment to the City's Consolidated Plan. A summary of the comments or views received, and a summary of any comments or views not accepted and the reasons therefor, shall be attached to the substantial amendment and submitted to HUD.

Comments on Substantial Amendments to the Consolidated Plan may be directed to:

City of Seattle CDBG Administrator
City of Seattle Human Services Department
618 Second Avenue, 7th Floor
Seattle, WA 98104

Complaint Procedures

Written complaints from the public about the Consolidated Plan, amendments or the performance report will receive a meaningful, written reply within **fifteen (15)** working days. The public may write to:

“Con Plan Report Complaints”
CDBG Administration Office
City of Seattle Human Services Department
618 Second Ave., 7th Floor
Seattle, WA 98104

Changing the Citizen Participation Plan

Substantial amendments to the Citizen Participation Plan can be made only after the public has been notified of intent to modify it, and only after the public has had a reasonable opportunity to review and comment on proposed substantial change. Substantial amendments to the Citizen Participation Plan must be adopted by City Council.

VI. Section 108 Loan Guarantee Projects, Citizen Participation Plan

Technical Assistance

The City will provide technical assistance to groups who are developing proposals that may benefit from and be eligible for Section 108 Loan Guarantee Fund assistance. The City will provide assistance through the Office of Economic Development or through a contracted assistance provider. Technical assistance will include an initial review of the proposed project and a financial and regulatory feasibility assessment. The level and type of assistance will be determined at the discretion of the Office of Economic Development.

Public Hearings

Two public hearings will be held for the Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program, and an additional two public hearings will be held for each Section 108 Loan Guarantee application.

Two public hearings will be held for the Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program for the purposes of obtaining the views of citizens and for formulating or responding to proposals and questions. The first hearing will be held in the spring in combination with the initial public hearing for the Consolidated Plan. The second public hearing will be held in July in conjunction with the second public hearing for

the Consolidated Plan. Both hearings will address community development and housing needs, development of proposed activities (proposed Section 108 loans) and review of program performance. At the second hearing community members will be able to review and comment on the draft Consolidated Plan, which will include a description of the Section 108 program.

Two public hearings will be held for each Section 108 Loan Guarantee application. All Section 108 Loan Guarantee applications must be approved by the City Council. The public hearing for each Section 108 Loan Guarantee application will be held in conjunction with a Council Committee meeting/briefing regarding a Resolution that authorizes the application to be submitted to HUD. Based on input from the public and the Council Committee regarding the proposed application, the City will consider comments from the public hearing and modify the application if appropriate. The second public hearing will be held in conjunction with the City Council Committee that will vote on the Ordinance authorizing the contractual agreements to implement the loan proposal (after HUD's approval of the City's Section 108 Loan Guarantee application.)

For the Consolidated Plan hearings and for the Section 108 Loan Guarantee application hearings, the City will provide the appropriate accommodations if the project affects non-English speaking persons. Translators will be provided for people who do not speak English when requests are made at least five working days prior to a hearing. For public hearings specific to an application, the City will work with applicable community based development organizations to conduct outreach to non-English speaking persons. In addition, community members can call (206) 233-3885 to make arrangements for translated materials and recordings. The public announcement will also indicate services that are accessible for physically disabled individuals (print and communication access will be provided upon request).

Location of Hearings

The Section 108 Loan Guarantee application hearings will be held at the City of Seattle's Council Chambers. Every attempt will be made to schedule these hearings during evening hours. For public hearings the City will provide contact information that includes a phone number, address and an e-mail address for citizens that wish to provide additional feedback or for citizens who cannot attend the public hearing.

Notices of Public Hearings

Notices of Section 108 Loan Guarantee application public hearings will be published in the Daily Journal of Commerce and any applicable local or ethnic newspapers **fifteen (15)** days in advance of the hearing.

All notices will include the amount of guaranteed loan funds expected to be made available for the coming year (*including program income anticipated to be generated by the activities carried out with guaranteed loan funds*) and the amounts proposed to be used for activities that benefit low- and moderate-income persons.

All notices for program applications will include:

- a description of the proposed activity, the amount of the guaranteed loan, and any program income to be generated;
- a citation of the National Objective (*benefit to low- and moderate-income persons, elimination of slum and blight or urgent need*) and the activity eligibility (e.g., area benefit, housing, jobs, limited clientele, etc); and whether the activity will result in displacement. If the project displaces

individuals, then the public hearing notice will either detail the City's displacement plans or provide information on how to access the displacement plan.

If substantial changes are to be made to the original 108 Loan application, a public notice of the hearing/application will describe the substantial changes that are being proposed. A substantial change to the Section 108 Loan Guarantee application is defined as any change to the borrower, loan amount, project activity, project location, fees, term and security.

Availability of Application

A proposed application and supporting documents will be made available to the public two weeks prior to the public hearing (Council Committee meeting) through either a direct request for information from the Office of Economic Development or through the City of Seattle's website, which will be enumerated in the public notice. In addition, copies of the application will be available at the list of libraries and neighborhood service centers listed on the first page of this Plan. A copy of the final application, as submitted to HUD, will be available to the public by request at the City of Seattle Office of Economic Development.

Grievances and Complaints

The Office of Economic Development will respond to any written citizen grievances or complaints within **fifteen (15)** days of receipt of such notice, where practicable. In all public notices and during the public hearings, the City will make available contact information for citizens who wish to express any grievances or complaints regarding the project.

Encouragement of Citizen Participation

The City encourages citizen participation, particularly by low- and moderate-income persons, through the means articulated under "Encouraging Citizen Participation" as found elsewhere in this Plan. In addition, the City will encourage citizen participation by using the City's network of community-based development organizations, which represent many of the geographic areas in which Section 108 projects are located.

VII. Residential Anti-displacement and Relocation Assistance

Seattle will minimize displacement of families and individuals from their homes and neighborhoods as a result of projects discussed in the Consolidated Plan and projects that are funded through Section 108 Loan Guarantee assistance. For those projects that receive funds from CDBG (Community Development Block Grant), HOME (Home Investments Partnerships Program), UDAG (Urban Development Action Grant) or a Section 108 Loan Guarantee (funds awarded under section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974) or funding from any program income that may accrue from these programs, the City has adopted a Residential Antidisplacement Plan and Relocation Assistance Policy that applies to such projects and that specifies the levels of relocation assistance available. (See Ordinance 119163). For projects included in the Consolidated Plan that do not receive funds from CDBG, HOME, UDAG or Section 108 Loan Guarantee funds, the City has other ordinances in place that may apply and that may require relocation assistance for any persons displaced as a result of certain projects. For any projects that involve City-funded acquisition of property that may also include state or federal funds, SMC chapter 20.84, which provides for relocation assistance in certain instances, applies and specifies relocation assistance available. For projects that do not involve state or federal assistance that involve demolition, change of use, substantial rehabilitation, or removal of subsidized housing restrictions that may result in displacement, SMC chapter 22.210 applies and provides for relocation assistance to low-income renter households. For projects that may involve displacement of renters from residential rental projects converting to condominiums, SMC chapter 22.903 applies and provides for relocation assistance to such persons.

PARTICIPATION SUMMARY

To increase the participation of low-and moderate-income Seattle residents, several community meetings, forums and focus groups were held and surveys administered over the course of the last few years to illicit ideas and comments about strategies identified in the Strategies section of this Consolidated Plan under each of the four goals. Meetings that include citizens were held at time and locations considered convenient for those who are working and allow for accommodations for persons with disabilities. Highlighted below is a summary of some of the meetings that informed program policy development outlined in the Strategic Plan. In addition to meetings, a Community Development Household Survey was administered to Seattle residents to capture their views about priority needs of low- and moderate income people and to engage people whose input is not typically sought or heard in city planning processes. Results of the survey are summarized in Section 3, Needs Assessment and in Appendix E, the Community Development Household Survey Report.

Human Services

Strategic Investment Plan - Community Involvement Process

The Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) is the Seattle Human Services Department's strategic plan to guide the City's investments in human services. There was a stakeholder involvement process for the Strategic Investment Plan which included over 40 focus group discussions across six stakeholder groups (clients, funders, employees, providers, neighborhoods / residents, and faith, business and other community leaders). Each focus group included a brief overview of the Department and the framework for the Strategic Investment Plan, as well as discussion on key options for considerations.

The following summary describes major themes across community stakeholders and key themes amongst the Department employee focus groups:

1. Major Themes - Community Stakeholders

Cross Community Stakeholder Groups:

- There was appreciation for the department's community involvement process and interest in continued dialogue with the department.
- There was strong support for the department's continued funding for **both** Safety Net and Prevention/Economic Self-Sufficiency Programs.
- Services most often mentioned as priorities included shelter with services (employment and case management), education and employment, youth activities, child care subsidies and services, culturally relevant services especially for immigrant and refugees, and domestic violence services and shelters.
- Access to information about and delivery of coordinated holistic services was a noted concern.

- Interest in culturally relevant, community-based information, outreach and access to services was also discussed across groups.

Additional themes within Community Stakeholder Groups:

Funders

- Appreciated the system approach, expressed interest in aligning resources. A number of funders were interested in collaborating on evaluation, goal setting and regional funding.

Clients

- Noted appreciation for Seattle's good services, though there is not enough to meet all of the needs.
- Homeless families prioritized education programs to help their children and, at a meeting with forty homeless men, the group's consensus was that shelter for women and children should be prioritized over shelter services for single men.
- Clients also discussed the importance for programs and staff to be accountable, treat clients with respect and understand their needs. Comments in this area included a need for training and increased outreach to communities of color.
- In relation to ongoing relationships with stakeholder groups, there was a common theme for homeless population focus groups: more City departments should hold focus groups and that HSD should meet with the community more often.

Providers

- There was focused concern for increased cost of tracking outcomes and a need for streamlined reporting and user friendly technology.
- Need for increased agency capacity building was mentioned across providers (e.g., staff training to improve services, information technology and fund development).
- Agencies also spoke to the need for HSD to collaborate more with large entities such as Parks and Recreation, the School District and Public Health.
- Across providers, HSD was viewed as needing to strengthen its advocacy role at the state and federal level. Survival services providers recommended increasing funding for community education and organizing.

2. Employee Focus Group Themes

- Strong themes across the employee focus groups were to place a greater emphasis on prevention and to help people make meaningful change in their lives for the long-term.
- There is strong sentiment that HSD needs to increase accountability to the community and that the Department needs increased community leadership and involvement.
- Coordinated and holistic approaches to working with customers and more services for immigrant and refugee groups were most mentioned in terms of service needs.
- Increased private sector involvement in human services was the most mentioned partnership issue mentioned by groups. This includes educating, organizing and facilitating strategies to increase understanding of the value of human services and inclusion of private sector representatives on a human services advisory council.

Community Stakeholder Focus Groups

Consumers / clients

- Seattle Youth Employment students
- Upward Bound / Rewarding Youth Achievement students
- Seattle Jobs Initiative – Office and Manufacturing Classes
- Aging and Disability Services Advisory Council sub-committee
- Early Childhood Education (parents & providers)
- WHEEL
- Hammond House- Women's Shelter
- SHARE
- Sacred Heart Shelter
- Self Sufficiency Project – East Cherry YWCA
- St. Paul's Shelter

Faith Communities / Businesses / Other Community Leaders

- Downtown Ministerial Association
- A Philip Randolph Association (Central)

Neighborhood / Residents

- Native Action Network
- Community Alliance for Youth
- Central Neighborhood District Council
- Southeast Weed & Seed

Funders (Key Informant Meetings)

- United Way
- Casey Family
- Allen Foundation
- Seattle Housing Authority
- Gates Foundation

Providers

- Seattle Human Services Coalition
- Minority Executive Director's Coalition
- COREC (Communities of Refugee Empowerment Coalition)
- Family Support Workers
- West Seattle Providers Coalition
- Family Support Centers, Directors
- Steering Committee / Coalition for the Homeless
- Family Services – homeless families
- Meals Partnership Coalition
- Seattle Food Committee
- Asian-Pacific Islander Director's Coalition

- School's Out Washington

Homelessness

During the past year, several opportunities were provided for public participation in the ongoing review and refinement of the Continuum of Care system for at risk and homeless people. Providers of housing and support services, key stakeholders, homeless people, elected officials of local governments, philanthropic organizations, business leaders, and the community at large engaged in several forums and policy groups including: Seattle King county Coalition for the Homeless, Seattle Housing & Resource Effort (SHARE), the Committee to End Homelessness (CEH), the McKinney Continuum of Care Steering Committee, the Health Care for the Homeless Planning Council, and Taking Health Care Home King County Funders Group. (Are these the right groups? Are there others?) These groups are described in more detail in Section 3, Needs Assessment: Nature and Extent of Homelessness.

Seattle King County Coalition for the Homeless (SKCCH)

Since its inception more than two decades ago, this coalition of 80-plus members continue to be one of the primary means for gathering information and airing important issues on homelessness in our region. Several City staff participate regularly in the general membership and various committee meetings each month. Of particular note, meetings held in April 2003 and March 2004 were important to the development and refinement of the Human Services Department's Strategic Development Plan (SIP) including community priorities, concerns and suggestions for homelessness services implementations. The March 2004 meeting was a focus group to gather citizen, clients and provider comments, suggestions and recommendations regarding the direction and scope of the SIP.

Committee to End Homelessness

The Committee to End Homelessness (CEH) is a region-wide forum to oversee Seattle-King County's homelessness response or Continuum of Care. CEH sets policy direction and guidance for Seattle and the neighboring communities' approach to responding to the range of services and housing affecting homeless people and people at risk of homelessness, including people who are chronically homeless. The City of Seattle actively participates in this regional forum, linking the planning process to this Consolidated Plan. In 2003 and 2004, monthly meetings of the committee and its planning groups were held. In 2003, the CEH established its membership, roles and responsibilities, and a process for establishing a vision and a plan for ending homelessness by the year 2014. In 2004, the CEH developed its first draft of the Framework Plan to End Homelessness and presented it to the public for review and comment.

The Committee's recommendations, which are expected in the early winter of 2004, will be utilized by Seattle, King County, and neighboring communities to guide how our resources will be utilized to achieve funding outcomes that move people out of homelessness.

Community Meetings on Eviction Prevention Request for Proposals

From January 2002 to February 2003, a series of meetings were held with community providers to gather information about eviction prevention services currently funded by the Seattle Human Services Department (HSD), Community Services Division (CSD) and inform provider agencies about the Request for Proposal process. CSD staff gathered information about the need for eviction prevention efforts in Seattle and learned how agencies and community representatives would use funding if they were Human Services Department decision makers.

Participants included staff and community representatives from: Legal Action Center, Tenant's Union, Seattle-King County Coalition for the Homeless, YWCA's Project Self-Sufficiency, Plymouth Housing Group, Affordable Housing for the Archdiocesan Housing Authority, Seattle Jobs Initiative, Catholic Community Services Family Support Center, Neighborhood House Project Reach, Fremont Public Association Family Program, International District Housing Alliance, Family Services Resident Choices Program. Additionally, a meeting with a group of subject matter experts in February 2003 to gather information to refine the RFP, the services being solicited and clients served.

Economic and Community Development

The Office of Economic Development (OED) conducted a comprehensive assessment of the strategies it employs to provide economic, community, small business and workforce development programs that serve low- and moderate-income individuals. This assessment was essential in the development of the community and economic development programs that are administered by OED and included in the 2005-2008 Consolidated Plan.

The assessment included outreach to internal and external stakeholder and community groups to: (1) evaluate whether OED's programs are meeting the needs of the communities and individuals it serves; and, (2) learn about how to strengthen the programs and improve service. In addition, OED paid particular attention to whether and how the needs of people and communities of color are being met by OED's programs and contractors.

The summary below lists all the meetings and interviews conducted as part of this assessment. All the individuals and organizations listed below were interviewed either by OED staff or consultants working on behalf of OED during the months of February through May 2004:

Strategic Plan Stakeholder Interviews

Summary of Outreach:

- Community and Economic Development focus (including small business development and workforce development)
 - Interviews of 27 community stakeholders regarding business, communities and economic development (includes 3 council members and a former mayor)
 - Focus group of Community Development Corporation executive directors and key staff
 - Electronic survey sent to 61 of our community development partners
- Neighborhood business district focus
 - Interviews of 10 neighborhood business district organizations
 - Interviews of 3 professionals that work in the community economic development field
 - Best practice research looking at 10 cities throughout the county
- Race and Social Justice focus
 - Interviews of 13 community stakeholders from a cross section of ethnic and communities of color in the Seattle area

List of Individuals Interviewed

Community & Economic Development

- Councilmember Drago, City of Seattle
- Councilmember McIver, City of Seattle
- Councilmember Steinbruck, City of Seattle
- Norm Rice, President and Chief Executive Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of Seattle
- Tom Tierney, Seattle Housing Authority
- James Kelly, President Urban League of Metropolitan Seattle
- Mary Jean Ryan, Director, City of Seattle Office of Policy & Management
- Chuck Depew, National Development Council
- Tom Lattimore, Executive Director Impact Capital
- Paige Chapel, Solutions in Community Development and Finance
- Dorothy Lengyel, President Pittsburgh Partnership for Neighborhood Development
- Kate Joncas, Executive Director, Downtown Seattle Association
- Nathan Torgelson, Economic Development Director, City of Kent

Small Business Development

- Shaw Canale, Executive Director Cascadia Revolving Loan Fund
- Jim Thomas, Executive Director Community Capital Development

Workforce Development

- Bob Falk, Co-owner TRAC Associates
- Rhonda Simmons, Executive Director Seattle Jobs Initiative
- Kris Stadelman, CEO WorkForce Development Council
- Jean Tinnea, Founder of Unity on Union
- Ollievette Wade, Cherry Street Association

Neighborhood Business District Development

- Ballard Chamber of Commerce
- Broadway BIA
- Cherry Street Association
- Columbia City Business Association
- Chinatown/International District BIA
- Greater University Chamber of Commerce
- Pioneer Square Community Association
- Wallingford Chamber of Commerce
- West Seattle Junction BIA
- White Center Community Development Association

Regional Business Development

- Sam Anderson, Chair Economic Development Council; Master Builders Association
- Martha Choe, State 7E7 Coordinator
- Bob Drewel, Executive Director, Puget Sound Regional Council; Economic Development District
- Deborah Knutson, Snohomish County Economic Development Council
- Steve Leahy, Greater Seattle Chamber of Commerce
- Joe Quintana, The Regional Partnership
- Bob Watt, Vice President, Government and Community Relations, Boeing
- Juli Wilkerson, Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

Best Practice Research

- Austin, TX
- Boston, MA
- Chicago, IL
- Denver, CO
- Minneapolis, MN
- Phoenix, AZ
- Portland, OR
- San Diego, CA
- Santa Monica, CA
- Tacoma, WA

Race and Social Justice Interviews: The following interviews covered all aspects of OED's programs and operations from the perspective of how well the agency serves communities of color:

- Ollivette Wade, Cherry Street Association
- Pauline Zeestraten, Chinatown/International District BIA
- Karen Kinney, Columbia City Business Association

- Sue Taoka, Executive Director, Seattle Chinatown International District PDA
- Rick Dupree, Executive Director, NPower Seattle
- Rhonda Simmons, Executive Director, Seattle Jobs Initiative
- Norward Brooks, Seattle Vocational Institute
- Minh-Duc Pham Nguyen, Executive Director, Helping Link
- Aboubaker A. Ali, Employment and Training Supervisor, WorkSource
- Mario Paredes, Executive Director, Consejo Counseling and Referral Service
- Dorry Elias, Executive Director, Minority Executive Director's Coalition
- Patricia Pachal, Board Member, Save Our Valley and RVCDF

Housing

The Office of Housing held a Key Stakeholders Meeting on May 18, 2004 to discuss housing issues related to the 2005-2008 Consolidated Plan.

Purpose of the meeting was to solicit feedback from stakeholders on draft housing strategies (Con. Plan Goal 1) and draft rental housing priorities and siting policy.

People involved included the following:

Paul Lambros	Plymouth Housing Group
Megan Farley	WA Low Income Housing Alliance
Carla Okigwe	Housing Development Consortium
Robin Amadon	Low Income Housing Institute
Sharon Lee	Low Income Housing Institute
Tara Connor	Plymouth Housing Group
Katy Thomas Miller	Fremont Public Association
John Shaw	HomeSight
Colby Bradley	YMCA
Megan Altimore	YMCA
Roberta Schur	Impact Capital
Cheryl DeBoise	Impact Capital
Sarah Lewontin	Housing Resources Group
June Bueford	Department of Public Health
Liz Swope	The Salvation Army
Steve Walker	WA State Housing Finance Commission
Joe Marley	Rainier Beach Community Club
Mark Dalton	Dept of Social & Health Services - Belltown
Geoff Spelman	Mt. Baker Housing Association
Humberto Alvarez	Fremont Public Association
Rick Hooper	City of Seattle, Office of Housing
Katie Hong	
Tina Shamseldin	
Joanne LaTuchie	
Maureen Kostyack	

Laura Hewitt Walker	
Georgia Conti	City of Seattle, Department of Human Services

The following are the notes from the meeting.

Part I. Strategic Plan: Priorities and Emerging Issues

Objective 1. Increase and Maintain the Supply of Affordable Rental Housing

- Strenuously oppose any cuts to federal subsidies
- Identify public \$ available for refinancing strategies
 - lower rents from 50% MFI to 30% MFI
 - take advantage of slow absorption rate in tax credit units
 - address need for very low income units
- Support new dedicated funds for housing development
 - Land banking
 - Growth-related fund
 - Loan guarantee
- Support increase in federal resources

National Housing Trust Fund, including Preservation of Section 8

- Support use of eminent domain in cooperation with SHA
- Develop strategies to address increasing demand for low-income housing when planned development exceeds the rate of growth anticipated by the Levy (e.g., South Lake Union)

Link low-income housing to redevelopment and major projects

Create new dedicated funds

- Increase OH bridge loan program, and increase term beyond 2 years, to address longer development time-frames due to demand for subsidy funds
- Eliminate land use barriers: parking, zoning and density
- Incorporate fair share language in City low-income housing policies to communicate the expectation that every community should provide low-income housing

Objective 2. Provide service-enriched housing for homeless and special needs populations

- Change wording of the Objective to say homeless and/or special needs
- Tie in with the Committee to End Homelessness' 10 Year Plan
(Housing First Model)
- Capitalize service fund component to provide on-going services funding
 - Section 8 is not enough for some projects,
 - Reconsider policy that prevents use of both Levy O&M and Section 8
- Maintain priority for Section 8 for the homeless, but not at risk of causing other households to become homeless because they can't access Section 8
- Remove zoning barriers to small unit housing outside Downtown

Replace parking requirement with TMP

Achieve higher density with very small units

- Get services \$ more in sync with housing \$, for example, through coordination of data, funding, setting priorities for services in housing funded by OH
- Extend utility rate reduction to projects with operating subsidy
- Prioritize Section 8 vouchers to help transition formerly homeless families and individuals to permanent housing. (Exit vouchers.)
- Encourage private foundations and United Way to refocus on housing, in addition to their services funding

Objective 3. Increase homeownership opportunities for low-income households, and assist low-income homeowners make needed repairs

- Preserve existing mobile home parks
- Encourage SHA to make some of its Scattered Site housing that will be sold available to nonprofits to provide ownership opportunities for low-income buyers
- Revisit the homeowner goals in SHA's HOPE VI projects to ensure a mix of incomes in the homeownership units
- Develop strategies to help first-time homebuyers stay in their homes
 - Increase resources for housing counseling
 - Consider local legislation to prevent banks from making aggressive loans that put lower incomes buyers at risk of losing their home
 - Develop/evaluate information about stability in ownership housing, such as SOCR data on mortgage defaults
- Make home ownership development a priority for City surplus land
- Find solutions for condo liability insurance problems, which will help attract construction financing and equity investment

Objective 4. Use affordable housing as a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization in distressed communities and increasing housing in Seattle's urban villages

- Address the problem of housing that is not built to the allowable density
 - Consider code changes that require a minimum density, taking into account financing implications, especially Tax Credit policy which gives points for small projects
- Address conflict between City policy that promotes dispersal of low-income housing and Tax Credit policy that rewards projects located in low-income communities (QCTs)
- In addition to encouraging growth in slow-growing areas, address the need for affordable housing in areas that are seeing growth, but it's not affordable
- Push for more mixed-use public projects, such as libraries and community centers with housing above. It's a double-standard to push private commercial development to include housing when public buildings do not.
- Identify incentives to build mixed-use projects, and projects that maximize density
- Encourage a strong partnership w/SHA to promote mixed use developments and revitalization projects.

Part II. Housing Policies

1. Dispersion Policy

- Waiver should be available where block groups have an abnormally small number of total housing units
- Consider limiting low-income housing development in a larger area than just block groups. Limit development in communities that contain block groups that exceed the threshold for low-income housing. Focus development instead in communities with low numbers of subsidized housing units
- Dispersion policy might raise fair housing concerns
- The policy change is an improvement over current policy. Reducing the amount of subsidized housing subject to the dispersion policy makes it easier to develop housing and better supports revitalization goals

2. Rental Priorities

- Several agencies are experiencing great problems finding housing for immigrant families that need larger units. This need may not be reflected in census data or SHA wait list statistics.
- Suggestion to look at King County data to see if large family need is reflected. There is a possibility of families having to go to South County for housing since supply of larger units in the City doesn't meet demand.
- Suggestion to clarify last recommended priority relating to TOD projects: current language suggests a project must incorporate transit into the building somehow to qualify.
- Suggestion to note high number of people of color who fall into housing needs categories, including homeless
- Suggestion to note that criminal histories are often used as a screening criteria for tenant selection and people are "falling through the cracks"

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Public Hearing June 15, 2004

A public hearing was held on June 15, 2004 at 9:30 a.m., in the City Council Chambers. Two community resident provided comments.

Suzanne Stouffer, Resident

Comment: I'm speaking on behalf of about 5 other people who live in the Northgate area who are in danger of losing their Section 8 when it is time for their renewal. Why have people who have Section 8 housing not been notified of this? Through Porch Light, I received Section 8 and heard about the possibility of losing it through word of mouth. My income is \$824 per month. If Section 8 is reversed, my rent would be \$750.

Response: Councilmember Tom Rasmussen offered a name of who to contact (Kathy Rosette, Seattle Housing Authority) to get clear information about what is really happening or going to happen with the Section 8 program.

Mary Monroe, Resident

Comment: I'm concerned about what's happening with the Section 8 program. I am 50-cents, 25-cents away from being on the streets. The struggle doesn't stop. I live on a \$600 budget. I live in South Park because I can't afford to live in Lake City. Three years ago, my son and I were homeless. No one would take my Section 8, I couldn't afford to live in Lake City. I'm always on the verge of getting my utilities cut off. I don't qualify for utility assistance because I have a housing subsidy. Utilities have cost me \$700. The City needs to look at these issues when deciding City budgets and not forget about people who are struggling. This plan reads like gobbledygook.

Response: Councilmember Tom Rasmussen suggested looking into a project similar to Project SHARE, a City of Seattle program that provides payment assistance and consultation for residential Seattle City Light customers in emergency situations.

Public Hearing August 17, 2004

A public hearing was held on August 17, 2004 at 5:30 p.m., in the NewHolly Community Meeting Room. Ten community representatives provided comments.

Chuck Weinstock, Capital Hill Housing Improvement Program

I am in support of the drafted document. I feel it does a really good job of embracing the continuum of housing needs in this city with all the important key touchstones of addressing homelessness and ending homelessness: an appropriate supply of decent affordable rental housing, supporting first time home buyers, and addressing the particular needs of revitalizing neighborhoods. All these things have been long standing objectives of the City. All are pretty strongly embedded in the Consolidated Plan and historic housing policies in this City. I'm pleased to see them continued and really quite well articulated.

I would make particular note of 2 elements I want to emphasize, one is Objective 4 in Goal 1 which speaks to increasing the supply of affordable housing in urban villages and around neighborhood business districts. In Capital Hill, which is in location with several business districts, one of which is intended to be a focus of some efforts to both increase the density and improve the commercial district. It also is the site of some anticipated major transportation improvements that at the moment is creating quite the shadow on the business district. We are all hoping it will ultimately happen and be a place where transit oriented development for both retail and housing would be appropriate. Support of the Consolidated Plan for that is particularly important.

Also (support is needed) where increasing housing costs places particular pressure on long term residents who find it increasingly harder to stay there and the small businesses (are) finding it increasingly hard for people in the \$7.00-\$10.00 an hour wage (range) to live close by.

Finally I want to make particular note of the reference in the plan for the work that the community development corporations in this city do. The challenge of providing affordable housing and providing it in a place-based way that supports other neighborhood objectives is a big job. It's an important one in the work that many of the other sister organizations to CHHIP do, especially in distressed neighborhoods (and) is of particular importance.

Councilmember Della: Do you support mixed used development, the combination of housing and commercial development?

Yes, we have already developed 8 such buildings, in the process of putting together a project at the south end of the Broadway business district at Broadway and Pine; a partnership with Walgreens who is building a 10,000 square foot store and enabling us to build 44 units of housing above. In a neighborhood where land is scarce, development opportunity is hard to get, Walgreens initially wanted a single use, single story store and the neighborhood disagreed saying it ought to be a store that maximizes the site. It ought to have housing and the housing ought to be affordable. The community not only supports but advocates for these opportunities. Having policies and a system that supports that is absolutely essential to urban village goals.

Karen Sisson, Senior Center for West Seattle

I'm here to talk about the Community Facilities portion (of the Con Plan). The strategic plan is wonderful, a lot of thought has gone into it. Your comments on facilities - I take in question. I would like to thank City Council. In about 1990, I applied for and received CDBG funds for renovation of the second level of our building...and thank you very much, we do have air conditioning so that we may use it in the afternoons. All windows face west. In the summer, we had to close down. I had to let staff go at 3:00 because it was an oven. When it comes to the different facilities run by private/non-profits in the different areas of Seattle we only have foundations, private donations, and commercial loans that we rely on, other than the City funds. They (the City funds) are very important to us. When I applied before, the City had 1.3 million dollars to be allocated. Last year, it was under \$400,000. When it comes to a facility actually going through the process and jumping through the hoops that the City has, it needs to be a substantial amount for it to be worth our while, I'm sorry to say. When the amount continually goes down it's disheartening to even participate in the program. So, I would really like you to think about keeping those funds up.

Tony To, Homesight

I want to speak on the capacity support for the CDCs. Over the last few years, we've received either level or less support than we had historically because of budget conditions. Actually we've grown, we've been able to leverage the money and I think it's important for Council to understand that the public support for our work is very important leverage for private dollars. Right now we need to leverage every penny that we have, both on the operating side as well as the financing side to get things done for the community.

Paul Fischburg, Delridge Neighborhood Development Association

One of the strategies we use to deal with issues in the distressed communities is more dollars for police. Another strategy we use is to fund human services. The third strategy is to think comprehensively about community. I want to put a plug in for the third one. It feels like the Consolidated Plan is moving in that direction so I want to applaud that. We're not going to see a world that has no police and where we don't need human service provision. But the more that can be a part of a community safety network, a community network on a small geographic community level, I think the better. Like Tony and Chuck I want to speak to the CDCs (Community Development Corporations) as really the place where a lot of that is happening. We're doing projects that involve not only mixed use buildings with commercial space and housing, but also including community facilities as well. Social service space, arts and cultural facilities, economic development - the CDC's really are the forefront of putting these together. The way that the plan was presented to you, you have DON, OH, OED and Parks all looking at it from their own perspective. We're looking at it from the holistic point of view and yet we have to touch all of these different pots of money and all these different policies, and, as you Richard, brought up, all these different definitions. So I appreciate your pointing it out - let's have single definitions that we all speak to. I want the City to move more in that direction of trying to have the departments talk amongst themselves, having the priorities really look at that comprehensive approach.

On question raised "what is a living wage". Since we deal with housing I'll just point out that at a \$9 an hour job for a 2 bedroom apartment in our neighborhood you would be spending

62% of your income on housing. So we are looking at \$13-\$19 an hour as what we might call a living wage.

Laurel Spelman, Downtown Emergency Service Center

I work at DESC and we are involved in a continuing effort to create permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals. We applaud the City for the enormous effort and the goals that are included in the Consolidated Plan. I want to comment on one area that is a concern to our agency and our ability to site our housing.

That is the siting policies in the proposed plan. They are a great improvement over what is contained in the current plan. It still serves as a barrier to housing our clients. You think it would be a simple thing to be able to find land in Seattle. We are shut out of Pioneer Square, the ID (International District), we can't afford land in downtown because there isn't large undeveloped sites. So we're starting to look in neighborhoods surrounding downtown. Even though the plan is less constricting it still creates a barrier for larger projects. Our projects need to be larger in size because they provide the supportive services that can only be economically provided in projects, for example, over 50 units. We know it's a tough issue. I'd like to be self righteous here and say it's illegal, it's unjust, and it discriminates against low-income people. What we really need is some leadership around the issue. In our City today, we have enough diversity; we have a lot of gentrification going on. I'm not sure we need those protective policies any longer. It would be nice to strike them from our City policies.

Councilmember McIver: How do you see this as a problem?

We're looking in a neighborhood right now where the City policy would not allow City funding of projects that put a census tract block group at greater than 20% low-income housing. Many areas that have larger amounts of land available that are qualified census tracts which get a 30% bonus in tax credit dollars which we have to have in order to build our housing, are in those neighborhoods.

Councilmember McIver: Part of the legislation says that if you get community agreement you can waive that policy.

We would like to go into neighborhoods and work very earnestly with neighborhoods, but when you give the neighborhood the power it promotes NIMBY-ism (Not In My Back Yard-ism) it's nearly impossible to go into any neighborhood with this population.

Councilmember McIver: I would argue that if there is 20% low-income or assisted housing in this neighborhood in the first place NIMBY-ism isn't a real problem because it's already there.

It was already there before any siting policy was created.

Councilmember Rasmussen: Are there any other policies that are preventing the siting of housing?

Not really, we've actually found quite a bit of land. We are always looking in qualified census tracts which ties to the State Housing Finance Commission and typically that's in areas that have this problem.

Councilmember Rasmussen: So that's the primary barrier.

It presumes that our population isn't positive for that neighborhood. Bill Hobson will be writing a separate letter trying to get in touch with Council to comment on this.

Nancy Bratton, Matthieson's Flowers

Our shop has been in the Rainier Valley Community, Columbia City area for 97 years. It's a hard struggle. We went through 3½ years of a recession. I put in 60-70 hours a week just to keep my shop open. I had minority employees and had to let them go. The City was going to pave Rainier Avenue in the summer when business is slow and I've saved enough money to get me through the slow months. They paved the streets during my busy time of year, cut off all access to my shop. I was told if I filed a claim the City would reimburse me, I even sent in the comparison from 2003 to 2002. The amount I was asking for was a very small amount, enough to keep my shop open. The City was closing a shop that has been struggling for 97 years. I knew I wouldn't qualify for a bank loan so I went to CCD. What a phenomenal group. They treated me with dignity, with respect, they listened to my situation, they worked with me for a long time to get me loan to keep my doors open. They came through for me, the City didn't, (with) the small amount I was asking for. Just for what you took away from me, by closing off access to my shop. I wasn't asking for a dime more, just what you guys took from me and you weren't there for me. I am supposedly a minority owner, because I am female. Maybe I'm not dark enough. I had employees that were minority, single mothers that I had to let go because you guys didn't come through to help me keep my business going. So I had to let these people go. I may not be an immigrant because I was born and raised in Rainier Valley, and proud to say it. I was born in Holly Park, best years of my childhood. If it wasn't for CCD, the City would have successfully closed up a 97 year old shop. I'm retail service oriented who really cares about my customers. I go beyond whatever is asked of a retailer to satisfy my customers to the highest quality. I am so grateful to CCD. They were so professional and came through for me. I'm still counting on the City, I'm not done yet. They owe me for what they took from me, I'm not asking for a dime more. I've struggled through 3½ years of one of our worst retail recessions in a small neighborhood. I worked hard. I didn't work hard for you guys to shut my doors. You need me and I need you so we have to develop a partnership. Not only am I a business owner in Columbia City I am a resident of Columbia City. The South Seattle Police Precinct is located across the street and is one of the best in Washington State. They are hard workers, dedicated to the community, dedicated to doing the best effective job they can do. They are beat up every time something happens crime wise in the community. The nice things they do for us and the good things that they stand for are never heard about. We have the best South Seattle Precinct in existence.

Councilmember McIver: Your shop is at Rainier and Edmonds?

Corner of Rainier and Ferdinand. We were on Edmonds for over 60 years. I'm the fourth owner in 97 years and we are in our third location. And all I asked is when I filed my claim I was guaranteed that I would be compensated. And I wasn't.

Councilmember McIver: I don't know of anybody that would guarantee that, when you file a claim, that you would get paid. If somebody made that statement to you they were very presumptuous. If you have a good case you could win, but that is a separate division from the Legislative Division, in that it's the Legal Division, under City Attorney Tom Carr, who is a separate and elected official.

Councilmember Rasmussen: I'm pleased that CCD was able to help you.

Councilmember McIver: CCD is a result of a spin-off from the City, financed by the City, with money returned from City projects. So we were glad to help you too.

Mari Dee Johansen, Lutheran Public Policy Office

I also represent St. John Lutheran Church in Phinney Ridge. I want to address the main issue of homelessness. I am around homelessness all the time, I live across from a food bank, I see people sleeping in stairwells and in the libraries. My main emphasis is I would like to have funding increased for the Lutheran Alliance to create housing or Latch. They just built an Angle Lake housing project. It would be nice if they could do some low-income housing in the Ballard area because that's where a lot of the homeless are, including the library. I have emailed Council for the Compass Center which handles transitional housing as well as placing people into jobs.

Steve Erickson, El Centro de la Raza

My name is Steve Erickson and I'm the facility manager at El Centro. I'd like to thank the council for having this hearing and also would like to thank HSD, the Block Grant program for all the help they provided El Centro and other private non-profit social service agencies over the years. They've been an immense help by providing funds for architectural services and also for construction. I would like to say a few words about dollars for facilities, especially for facilities that serve the low-income people. We are where the rubber meets the road in some ways. We have 65 kids in are child care center, we have the after school program along with one of our tenants which is the I'WA'SIL Native American Boys and Girls Club. There are probably 100 kids involved in those after school programs just in our building - which is 95 years old. It's hanging in there, we're hanging in there, we're not going anywhere, we want to continue to serve the community. The projects that we've been working on are expensive. We have a boiler that's 95 years old. We got partial CDBG funds that we leveraged and got more funds from Olympia. We got our bids a couple weeks ago and the lowest bid was \$70,000 over our budget, so we are back to the drawing board. We're not even near asking for HVAC(?) yet, we just want to heat the building. When the boiler does go down there are a lot of people in the building that suffer. We are also part of the community, a gathering place. We have lots of meetings there, evening and weekend meetings. It is my understanding that the CDBG dollars are the only source of funds that the City provides for facilities in the City of Seattle. The

funds we receive from this program we can leverage and get other funds from foundations or from Olympia. You hear rumors of funds for building facades that just make things look nicer, we're asking just for the guts of the building that need attention from time to time. We have a long list and we hope that the facilities funds remain available and this downward trend in their availability be reversed because I think a lot of agencies are feeling the pinch as far as dollars for facilities. It's a difficult area to fund raise in.

Rick Friedhoff, The Compass Center

The Compass Center can be a poster child for what you are talking about here, about CDBG, and those groups of funds role in the development of a project. The Compass Center is in Pioneer Square and, over the years, it has received CDBG funds to improve it. But in the year 2000 we received a Block Grant fund to begin a plan to redevelop the Compass Center because it had been a homeless shelter for almost 50 years with virtually no on-going capital maintenance that desperately needed to be done. HSD provided a grant to begin planning how we can best use this building to really be an effective tool to deal with the subject of homelessness. It's a small building and on the 4th floor there were 62 men sleeping in 3,600 square feet of space. That 3,600 was their bedroom, restrooms, the meeting room, a stairway, an elevator, and if you compare that to a house it gives you some idea of the size. The question was, how can we use this building to be a really good tool going forward? While we were in the planning process we had the Nisqually earthquake and the building was basically destroyed. It was red-tagged, there were FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Act) funds available which appeared at first to possibly be the answer - but I can tell you they would go nowhere near the rebuilding of that building. We turned to the City of Seattle, we received the first funds necessary from OED (Office for Economic Development), a section 108 loan was arranged so that we could acquire the land adjacent to us so we could build a facility that would once again house all the people and services that were in that building prior. We needed funds from each department of the City, from HSD (Human Services Department) to rebuild the hygiene center because those funds would not be available from OH (Office of Housing), OED for the 108 loan so that the building was viable.

Susan Cary, Capital Hill Housing Improvement Program (CHHIP) and Housing Development Consortium (HDC)

I am the director of property development for CHHIP and we're also active members of the Housing Development Consortium of Seattle/KC which represents not only the non-profits that develop and manage affordable housing in Seattle, but also a large number of private lending institutions, contractors, architects, attorneys and other people who are working very hard to improve affordable housing and services in Seattle. I don't need to tell you all about the incredible need in this area, the increased competition for resources and the incredible impact that our city's housing programs and related services have had not just been benefiting low-income individuals, but also sparking community revitalization and leveraging private investments in our community. I want to speak more specifically to is the strategic plan and the current graph before you. The HDC Seattle Affinity group has reviewed the plan, we've looked at it certainly hard in our own specific community and we very much support the current draft, the goals and objectives they have outlined. Will all due respect to the DESC and

the incredible work that they do and I know how frustrated they can become with the siting and dispersion policies, as one who has worked in the Rainier Valley as well as in Central Seattle we have done a tremendous job in bringing people along to understand the really positive impact that affordable housing and revitalization can have in that community. The current draft reflects an incredible amount of work that a wide variety of individuals and organizations spent to develop them. I do support the draft.

Public Comment at Seattle Council Committee for Housing, Human
Services and Health
September 9, 2004

Sharon Lee, Low Income Housing Institute (LIHI)

Of the 6,000 homeless individuals that her agency serves, 60% are working part-time or full-time – but they are still homeless. The City must maintain and increase human services funding and cut funding elsewhere, not critical services. Community Facilities funding should be tripled, it's totally inadequate.

Housing has been cut in CDBG (Community Development Block Grant). We need to look towards adding new resources to low income housing, maybe float loan program, or Transit Oriented Development. There was a Central Area HUD housing project and a Laurelhurst project. When Office of Housing was approached, they said, "no money". There may be other ways, maybe float loan program to help with acquisition. Homewise, recaptured funds could be put to multi-family uses. Councilmanic bond could be a source to supplement the levy.

Written Comments from Survey Respondents April – May, 2004

“I work but where I live all the grocery stores are sky high. To get to the cheaper one is hard, then you have to carry them home. Regardless of race the stores in and around the Central Area are overpaid only because they can charge it due to elderly, public assistance and low income families.”

“Homeless teens, adults, elderly, and vets should all have access to a roof over their head and a social support system to get them contributing to society in any form.”

“I was laid off from job of 5 years because of my age and not skill or budget cuts. I am 54, healthy, well educated, ready to work, I WANT and NEED to work, but am turned down for jobs. Help older individuals - we are still valuable assets to our communities.”

“I am working as a temp because of a misdemeanor charge 3 years ago. No one will hire me - scared or something.”

“They should raise the minimum wage to \$8.00 an hour because low-income people can not live with the income they have.”

“Lost job that paid \$35-40k due to company moving jobs overseas. Need to do better providing health care and insurance for out of work families.”

“Help mothers stay at home with their pre-school kids to develop a solid base where they can get consistent discipline, love, home education, morals and numerous other benefits for the children and society.”

“I wish we had medical funding for people like my husband. He is a Mexican immigrant. We have been married a long time. He has never been to a dentist or a doctor. I worry about his health.”

“Assist the Hillman City area development. Do something about the loiterers (drug dealers). Encourage business development in Rainier Valley.”

“I am 59 years old and all my savings is going to my health care and medicine.”

“People need an address and food in their belly before getting a job. No address, no job. Educate the disadvantaged.”

“Am worried about the high number of registered sex offenders in my zip code (98106). A few right across from elementary school. Also, I want more police on my block (8600 block of 10th SW) patrolling my neighborhood because cars are being stolen and broken into, and houses are being burglarized.”

“Free adult education, free tutoring, more training jobs.”

“Lower property tax for unemployed or people working at reduced wages. Homebuyer assistance for newer home, current home too small for family, does not qualify to purchase larger home due to low wages.”

Wife and I run a small publishing company from home. Wife's cancer diagnosis the month after losing company health insurance decimated our savings and put our mortgage in jeopardy.”

“Really, we need to eliminate racism in our city so people of color can reach parity with white counterparts in all aspects of life.”

“Promote more in the Belltown area so that more businesses can help the neighborhood. We definitely have the buildings, building abandonment seems to be a big, big problem in the Belltown area – I can see everything from my window.”

“I feel there is a definite need to improve quality and quantity of assistance programs. Even though I make a decent living – things are still very difficult at times. More programs for the children will stop the cycle of ignorance and poverty.”

“Too many rich people/corps. Pay few taxes, poor and middle class pay more to make up the difference.”

“CRIME, CRIME, CRIME!!! Build all the stadiums you want (regardless of how we vote), but with my car broken into over 10 times, me and my money will be leaving this city soon.”

“We don't need more social programs. What is needed by Seattle is to create tax and other incentives to make businesses want to come here and stay here.”

“Part-time student and full-time job. Providing for 2 other people on my wages. I hope the City should consider helping people without jobs or working permits.”

“Less \$\$ and time devoted to building “Allentown” (South Lake Union) and more focus on needs of existing neighborhoods.”

“I rent for 1/3 of income in a building for formerly homeless (due to health). Neighborhood varies: condos along water to drug dealers & pimps on the streets probably from outside areas. Supermarkets are too far away to carry groceries.”

“You get put on the street in 3 days if you are late here (rent).⁽¹⁾ Renew BHP and MIP!!!!!!⁽²⁾ For crying out loud, how do you fix chronic health issues without healthcare?”

“Pass I-864 Tim Eyman measure. It would cut some local property taxes by 25%. Housing for low and middle income veterans families.”

“What is most important to me is getting off of assistance and having a permanent and steady job.”

“Get more food in churches and food banks for homeless hungry people.”

“Need more houses for low income.”

“Make sure that this information survey continues and not be put aside, our neighborhood is very important to us.”

“Can’t survive in this world today, jobs just ain’t hiring people anymore. Help us!!”

“Remodeling my apartment, programs that help a single mother with a makeover of my apartment, disability programs. This is a wonderful survey. I’m glad that we can now have an opinion, a thought, or other ideas that we need.”

“Please can you give me our housing section 8 to my family because my husband works on call only, my income is \$642 month but my rent is \$875 but can you give me our section 8.”

“Housing: section 8 housing benefit should help for working low income with children. One family member works, wife with children, no day care. They say she has to work? No response for rejection or acceptance after 2½ years waiting.”

“The quality of the neighborhood is a function of the people that inhabit the neighborhood. Physical quality isn’t the only thing that matters.”

“I have no job. I need to apply for housing.”

“I’m very grateful for low-income housing.”

“Need more policemen because of drug activities, theft, vandalism, etc.”

“In my neighborhood I have been a victim of a hate crime and attempted kidnapping while walking my son home from school, 2 blocks from my house. Can you make neighborhoods safer for us who do not have the luxury of owning a car? It’s sad when you can’t walk 2 blocks from your home without fear.”

“We have earned time off as well as sick and vacation pay.”

“Access transportation for work, build light rail train.”

“Co-pay has doubled, I pay up to \$150 a month, co-pay \$20.”

“Help with student loans (i.e grants for re-payments).”

“Extreme freeway noise, traffic and dust in First Hill neighborhood. Many people cough frequently and complaints have fallen on deaf ears.”

“I would like to suggest that we should not be charged too much w/utilities, especially for people making \$16,000 - \$21,000. The energy department is charging us too much, we don't have enough to pay all of our bills.”

“Since becoming unemployed 8 months ago I have benefited from many services offered by the City, very helpful, I thank you.”

“We need affordable housing for people with disabilities.”